REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination of the present application. This is a full and timely response to that outstanding Non-Final Office Action mailed July 2, 2010. Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 1, 3-20, and 22-35 remain pending. More specifically, claims 1, 16, 29, and 34 are amended. Claim 2 is canceled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer. No new matter is added to the present application by these amendments.

I.   **Telephone Interview**

The Examiner is encouraged to contact Assignee's attorney, after reviewing the present response, to resolve or discuss <u>any</u> questions or outstanding issues in an effort to expedite examination of the present application.

II.   **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 6-10, 12, 14, 16-19, 23-25, 27, 29, 32, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *O'Neal* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0171514) in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in further view of *Holmes* (U.S. Patent No. 6,178,331) in further view of *Spearman* (U.S. Patent No. 7,035,281) in further view of *Angwin* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0059405). The Office Action rejects claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Angwin* in further view of *Chuah* (U.S. Patent No. 6,400,722). The Office Action rejects claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly

being unpatentable over *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Angwin* in further view of *Kozdon* (U.S. Patent No. 6,456,601). The Office Action rejects claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Angwin* in further view of *Rogers* (U.S. Patent No. 6,301,484). The Office Action rejects claims 13, 20, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Angwin* in further view of *Bookspan* (U.S. Patent No. 6,636,888). The Office Action rejects claim 15, 26, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Angwin* in further view of *Lewis* (U.S. Patent No. 6,513,019). The Office Action rejects claims 28 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Angwin* in further view of *Ooe* (U.S. Patent No. 6,330,238). The Office Action rejects claims 33 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Angwin* in further view of *Lewis* in further view of *Bookspan*. Assignee traverses the rejections for at least the following reasons.

A.   Claims 1-3, 6-10, 12, and 14

Independent claim 1 recites:

A method for sending electronic mail from a client operating within a client-server architecture, the method comprising:
(a)   provisioning the client with client broadcast text messaging software;
(b)   provisioning a server with server broadcast text messaging software, wherein the server is in communication with the client;
(c)   broadcasting from the client a text message in a broadcast transmission in a format of the broadcast text messaging software using subject based addressing wherein text in a subject field of the text message indicates an intended recipient, and wherein the text message is a non-email formatted message and contains electronic mail parameters including a destination email address for the electronic mail in a body of the text message;
(d)   receiving the text message at the server after discerning from the text in the subject field that the text message is intended for the server;
(e)   reformatting the text message from the format of the broadcast text messaging software to a format compatible with an email server; and
(f)   forwarding the reformatted text message to the email server in an email transmission to the destination email address;
wherein broadcasting includes transmitting a text message from a single network component to all components on a network.

(Emphasis added).

Independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that the combination of *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Angwin* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "(c) broadcasting from the client a text message in a broadcast transmission in a format of the broadcast text messaging software using subject based addressing wherein text in a subject field of the text message indicates an intended recipient, and wherein the text

message is a non-email formatted message and contains electronic mail parameters including a destination email address for the electronic mail in a body of the text message; (d) receiving the text message at the server after discerning from the text in the subject field that the text message is intended for the server; (e) reformatting the text message from the format of the broadcast text messaging software to a format compatible with an email server, wherein the reformatted text message is addressed to the destination email address obtained from the body of the text message; and (f) forwarding the reformatted text message to the email server in an email transmission to the destination email address, wherein broadcasting includes transmitting a text message from a single network component to all components on a network, " as emphasized above.

In an illustrative example, claim 1 provides for a messaging client, which does not have email software, to send an email message. This is done by the client broadcasting a text message containing email components (email body, subject, and address) intended for a messaging server. The server accepts the message and reformats the message as an email message. The email message is then forwarded to an email server from the messaging server. The email server can then send the email message.

In contrast, *O'Neal* discloses a message router which translates a message addressed to multiple recipients to multiple individual messages each addressed to an individual recipient. *See* abstract and summary. *O'Neal* further discloses: "A textual item is entered into a computer 204 at POINT A and transmitted to a

computer at POINT B, thus achieving <u>text-to-text messaging, principally in the email format</u>." Paragraph 0049. Accordingly, in *O'Neal*, text messaging is synonymous with email messaging. For example, *O'Neal* describes a scenario where a broadcast text message 506 is to be transmitted across a data network as an email. *O'Neal* explains "because the broadcast message 506 is already compatible with julie's receiving device 532 and because julie's receiving device 532, a computer 532, is addressable over the data network. The message router 514 supplies julie's email address and provides the fourth message 540 to the data network server 512 for delivery to a local data network interface 530 in Sao Paolo." Paragraph 0074. Therefore, as explained above, the broadcast message 506 is not reformatted as an email message, since the broadcast message is already in an email format.

Accordingly, *O'Neal* fails to address a server receiving a text message, reformatting the text message into an email format, and forwarding the message onto an email server.

Additionally, in *O'Neal*, a message is "broadcasted" only to addresses contained in the message and not to all components on a network. Further, in *O'Neal*, a recipient of a text message is not disclosed to receive the text message after discerning from a subject of the text message that the message is intended for the recipient. For at least these reasons, *O'Neal* fails to teach or suggest at least "(c) broadcasting from the client a text message in a broadcast transmission in a format of the broadcast text messaging software using subject based addressing wherein text in a subject field of the text message indicates an intended recipient, and wherein the text message is a non-email formatted

message and contains electronic mail parameters including a destination email address for the electronic mail in a body of the text message; (d) receiving the text message at the server after discerning from the text in the subject field that the text message is intended for the server; (e) reformatting the text message from the format of the broadcast text messaging software to a format compatible with an email server, wherein the reformatted text message is addressed to the destination email address obtained from the body of the text message; and (f) forwarding the reformatted text message to the email server in an email transmission to the destination email address, wherein broadcasting includes transmitting a text message from a single network component to all components on a network, " as recited in claim 1.

Further, *Holmes* describes matching an address of a sender with an alias of the sender associated with a reply. Accordingly, *Holmes* fails to address a server receiving a text message, reformatting the text message into an email format, and forwarding the message onto an email server.

Also, *Spearman* describes a wireless provisioning device capable of routing TCP/IP traffic. *Spearman* further discloses a gateway converting messages "between services using different E-mail protocols." Col. 4, lines 18-20. Accordingly, *Spearman* fails to address a server receiving a text message, reformatting the text message into an email format, and forwarding the message onto an email server.

As such, *Holmes* and *Spearman* do not remedy the deficiencies of *O'Neal*. In addition, *Angwin* discloses a process for automated discovery of a service

menu by broadcasting a message to a plurality of devices connected to a network requesting the service menu. *See* abstract. Accordingly, *Angwin* fails to address a server receiving a text message, reformatting the text message into an email format, and forwarding the message onto an email server. As such, *Angwin* does not remedy the deficiencies of *O'Neal*, *Holmes*, and *Spearman*. For that matter, the background section of Applicant's disclosure also does not remedy the aforementioned deficiencies.

As a result, *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Angwin* fails to teach or suggest at least "(c) broadcasting from the client a text message in a broadcast transmission in a format of the broadcast text messaging software using subject based addressing wherein text in a subject field of the text message indicates an intended recipient, and wherein the text message is a non-email formatted message and contains electronic mail parameters including a destination email address for the electronic mail in a body of the text message; (d) receiving the text message at the server after discerning from the text in the subject field that the text message is intended for the server; (e) reformatting the text message from the format of the broadcast text messaging software to a format compatible with an email server, wherein the reformatted text message is addressed to the destination email address obtained from the body of the text message; and (f) forwarding the reformatted text message to the email server in an email transmission to the destination email address, wherein broadcasting includes transmitting a text message from a single network component to all components on a network," as

recited in claim 1. Therefore, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn. Since claims 3, 6-10, 12, and 14 depend from claim 1 and recite additional features, claims 3, 6-10, 12, and 14 are also allowable over the cited art.

B.   Claims 4, 5, 11, 13, and 15

Assignee respectfully submits that *Chuah* does not make up for the deficiencies of *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Angwin* in disclosing all of the features of independent claim 1; *Kozdon* does not make up for the deficiencies of *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Troen-Krasnow* in disclosing all of the features of independent claim 1; *Rogers* does not make up for the deficiencies of *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Angwin* in disclosing all of the features of independent claim 1; *Bookspan* does not make up for the deficiencies of *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Angwin* in disclosing all of the features of independent claim 1; and *Lewis* does not make up for the deficiencies of *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Angwin* in disclosing all of the features of independent claim 1. Therefore, claims 4, 5, 11, 13, and 15 are considered patentable over any combination of the cited art for at least the reason that claims 4, 5, 11, 13, and 15 incorporate allowable features of claim 1 as set forth above.

C. Claims 16-19, 23-25, and 27

Independent claim 16 recites:

> A system for sending an electronic mail (email) from a client in a client-server architecture, the system comprising:
> (a) a plurality of clients, wherein each client of the plurality of clients contains client broadcast text messaging software, data processing software, and a client application program interface, and wherein each client is in communication with the plurality of clients;
> *(b) a text messaging server in communication with the plurality of clients, wherein the text messaging server contains server broadcast text messaging software and an email application program interface, wherein the email application program interface is adapted to receive a text message containing parameters of the electronic mail using subject based addressing in a broadcast transmission wherein the text message is a non-email formatted message and text in a subject field of the text message indicates an intended recipient and a destination email address is contained in a body of the text message, wherein the text messaging server discerns from the text in the subject field that the text message is intended for the text messaging server, and reformat the text message from a format compatible with the server broadcast text messaging software to a format compatible with an email server addressed to the destination email address;* and
> (c) an email server in communication with the text messaging server;
> *wherein the broadcast text messaging software is configured to transmit a text message from a single network component to all components on a network.*

(Emphasis added).

Independent claim 16 is allowable for at least the reason that the combination of *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Angwin* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "(b) a text messaging server in communication with the plurality of clients, wherein the text messaging server contains server broadcast text messaging software and an email application program interface, wherein the email application program interface is adapted to receive a text

message containing parameters of the electronic mail using subject based addressing in a broadcast transmission wherein the text message is a non-email formatted message and text in a subject field of the text message indicates an intended recipient and a destination email address is contained in a body of the text message, wherein the text messaging server discerns from the text in the subject field that the text message is intended for the text messaging server, and reformats the text message from a format compatible with the server broadcast text messaging software to a format compatible with an email server addressed to the destination email address . . . wherein the broadcast text messaging software is configured to transmit a text message from a single network component to all components on a network," as emphasized above.

In an illustrative example, claim 16 provides for a messaging client, which does not have email software, to send an email message. This is done by the client broadcasting a text message containing email components (email body, subject, and address) intended for a messaging server. The server accepts the message and reformats the message as an email message. The email message is then forwarded to an email server from the messaging server. The email server can then send the email message.

In contrast, *O'Neal* discloses a message router which translates a message addressed to multiple recipients to multiple individual messages each addressed to an individual recipient. *See* abstract and summary. However, *O'Neal* discloses: "A textual item is entered into a computer 204 at POINT A and transmitted to a computer at POINT B, thus achieving <u>text-to-text messaging, principally in the email</u>

format." Paragraph 0049. Accordingly, in *O'Neal*, text messaging is synonymous with email messaging. For example, *O'Neal* describes a scenario where a broadcast text message 506 is to be transmitted across a data network as an email. *O'Neal* explains "because the broadcast message 506 is already compatible with julie's receiving device 532 and because julie's receiving device 532, a computer 532, is addressable over the data network. The message router 514 supplies julie's email address and provides the fourth message 540 to the data network server 512 for delivery to a local data network interface 530 in Sao Paolo." Paragraph 0074. Therefore, as explained above, the broadcast message 506 is not reformatted as an email message, since the broadcast message is already in an email format.

Accordingly, *O'Neal* fails to address a server receiving a text message, reformatting the text message into an email format, and forwarding the message onto an email server.

Additionally, in *O'Neal*, a message is "broadcasted" only to addresses contained in the message and not to all components on a network. Further, in *O'Neal*, a recipient of a text message is not disclosed to receive the text message after discerning from a subject of the text message that the message is intended for the recipient. For at least these reasons, *O'Neal* fails to teach or suggest at least "(b) a text messaging server in communication with the plurality of clients, wherein the text messaging server contains server broadcast text messaging software and an email application program interface, wherein the email application program interface is adapted to receive a text message containing parameters of the electronic mail using subject based addressing in a broadcast transmission wherein the text

message is a non-email formatted message and text in a subject field of the text message indicates an intended recipient and a destination email address is contained in a body of the text message, wherein the text messaging server discerns from the text in the subject field that the text message is intended for the text messaging server, and reformats the text message from a format compatible with the server broadcast text messaging software to a format compatible with an email server addressed to the destination email address . . . wherein the broadcast text messaging software is configured to transmit a text message from a single network component to all components on a network," as recited in claim 16.

Further, *Holmes* describes matching an address of a sender with an alias of the sender associated with a reply. Accordingly, *Holmes* fails to address a server receiving a text message, reformatting the text message into an email format, and forwarding the message onto an email server.

Also, *Spearman* describes a wireless provisioning device capable of routing TCP/IP traffic. Further, *Spearman* discloses a gateway converting messages "between services using different E-mail protocols." Col. 4, lines 18-20. Accordingly, *Spearman* fails to address a server receiving a text message, reformatting the text message into an email format, and forwarding the message onto an email server.

As such, *Holmes* and *Spearman* do not remedy the deficiencies of *O'Neal*. In addition, *Angwin* discloses a process for automated discovery of a service menu by broadcasting a message to a plurality of devices connected to a network requesting the service menu. *See* abstract. Accordingly, *Angwin* fails to address

a server receiving a text message, reformatting the text message into an email format, and forwarding the message onto an email server. As such, *Angwin* does not remedy the deficiencies of *O'Neal*, *Holmes*, and *Spearman*. For that matter, the background section of Applicant's disclosure also does not remedy the aforementioned deficiencies.

As a result, *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Angwin* fails to teach or suggest at least "(b) a text messaging server in communication with the plurality of clients, wherein the text messaging server contains server broadcast text messaging software and an email application program interface, wherein the email application program interface is adapted to receive a text message containing parameters of the electronic mail using subject based addressing in a broadcast transmission wherein the text message is a non-email formatted message and text in a subject field of the text message indicates an intended recipient and a destination email address is contained in a body of the text message, wherein the text messaging server discerns from the text in the subject field that the text message is intended for the text messaging server, and reformats the text message from a format compatible with the server broadcast text messaging software to a format compatible with an email server addressed to the destination email address . . . wherein the broadcast text messaging software is configured to transmit a text message from a single network component to all components on a network," as recited in claim 16. Therefore, the rejection of claim 16 should be withdrawn. Since claims 16-19, 23-25,

and 27 depend from claim 16 and recite additional features, claims 16-19, 23-25, and 27 are also allowable over the cited art.

D.   Claims 13, 15, 20, 22, 26, and 28

Assignee respectfully submits that *Bookspan* does not make up for the deficiencies of *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Angwin* in disclosing all of the features of independent claim 16; *Lewis* does not make up for the deficiencies of *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Angwin* in disclosing all of the features of independent claim 16; and *Ooe* does not make up for the deficiencies of *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Angwin* in disclosing all of the features of independent claim 16. Therefore, claims 13, 15, 20, 22, 26, and 28 are considered patentable over any combination of the cited art for at least the reason that claims 13, 15, 20, 22, 26, and 28 incorporate allowable features of claim 16 as set forth above.

E.   Claims 29 and 32

Independent claim 29 recites:

> A method for sending an electronic mail (email) comprising:
> *(a)   broadcasting from a client computer a text message in a broadcast format using subject based addressing wherein the text message is a non-email formatted message; text in a subject field of the text message; and the text message is a non-email formatted message and a body of the text message contains a destination email address, email subject, and email body for the electronic email, wherein the client computer is part of a client-server architecture;*

> **(b)** receiving the text message at a server computer of the client-server architecture after discerning from the text in the subject field that the text message is intended for the server computer;
> **(c)** reformatting the text message from the broadcast format to an email format having the destination email address, the email subject, and the email body from the text message; and
> **(d)** forwarding the reformatted text message to an email server that is compatible with the email format;
> **wherein broadcasting includes transmitting a text message from a single component on a network**.

(Emphasis added).

Independent claim 29 is allowable for at least the reason that the combination of *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Angwin* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "(a) broadcasting from a client computer a text message in a broadcast format using subject based addressing wherein the text message is a non-email formatted message; text in a subject field of the text message; and a body of the text message contains a destination email address, email subject, and email body for the electronic email, wherein the client computer is part of a client-server architecture; (b) receiving the text message at a server computer of the client-server architecture after discerning from the text in the subject field that the text message is intended for the server computer; (c) reformatting the text message from the broadcast format to an email format having the destination email address, the email subject, and the email body from the text message; and (d) forwarding the reformatted text message to an email server that is compatible with the email format, wherein

broadcasting includes transmitting a text message from a single component on a network," as emphasized above.

In an illustrative example, claim 29 provides for a messaging client, which does not have email software, to send an email message. This is done by the client broadcasting a text message containing email components (email body, subject, and address) intended for a messaging server. The server accepts the message and reformats the message as an email message. The email message is then forwarded to an email server from the messaging server. The email server can then send the email message.

In contrast, *O'Neal* discloses a message router which translates a message addressed to multiple recipients to multiple individual messages each addressed to an individual recipient. *See* abstract and summary. However, *O'Neal* discloses: "A textual item is entered into a computer 204 at POINT A and transmitted to a computer at POINT B, thus achieving text-to-text messaging, principally in the email format." Paragraph 0049. Accordingly, in *O'Neal*, text messaging is synonymous with email messaging. For example, *O'Neal* describes a scenario where a broadcast text message 506 is to be transmitted across a data network as an email. *O'Neal* explains "because the broadcast message 506 is already compatible with julie's receiving device 532 and because julie's receiving device 532, a computer 532, is addressable over the data network. The message router 514 supplies julie's email address and provides the fourth message 540 to the data network server 512 for delivery to a local data network interface 530 in Sao Paolo." Paragraph 0074. Therefore, as explained above, the

broadcast message 506 is not reformatted as an email message, since the broadcast message is already in an email format.

Accordingly, *O'Neal* fails to address a server receiving a text message, reformatting the text message into an email format, and forwarding the message onto an email server. Additionally, in *O'Neal*, a message is "broadcasted" only to addresses contained in the message and not to all components on a network. Further, in *O'Neal*, a recipient of a text message is not disclosed to receive the text message after discerning from a subject of the text message that the message is intended for the recipient. For at least these reasons, *O'Neal* fails to teach or suggest at least "(a) broadcasting from a client computer a text message in a broadcast format using subject based addressing wherein the text message is a non-email formatted message; text in a subject field of the text message; and a body of the text message contains a destination email address, email subject, and email body for the electronic email, wherein the client computer is part of a client-server architecture; (b) receiving the text message at a server computer of the client-server architecture after discerning from the text in the subject field that the text message is intended for the server computer; (c) reformatting the text message from the broadcast format to an email format having the destination email address, the email subject, and the email body from the text message; and (d) forwarding the reformatted text message to an email server that is compatible with the email format, wherein broadcasting includes transmitting a text message from a single component on a network," as recited in claim 29.

Further, *Holmes* describes matching an address of a sender with an alias of the sender associated with a reply. Accordingly, *Holmes* fails to address a server receiving a text message, reformatting the text message into an email format, and forwarding the message onto an email server.

Also, *Spearman* describes a wireless provisioning device capable of routing TCP/IP traffic. *Spearman* further discloses a gateway converting messages "between services using different E-mail protocols." Col. 4, lines 18-20. Accordingly, *Spearman* fails to address a server receiving a text message, reformatting the text message into an email format, and forwarding the message onto an email server.

As such, *Holmes* and *Spearman* do not remedy the deficiencies of *O'Neal*. In addition, *Angwin* discloses a process for automated discovery of a service menu by broadcasting a message to a plurality of devices connected to a network requesting the service menu. *See* abstract. Accordingly, *Angwin* fails to address a server receiving a text message, reformatting the text message into an email format, and forwarding the message onto an email server. As such, *Angwin* does not remedy the deficiencies of *O'Neal*, *Holmes*, and *Spearman*. For that matter, the background section of Applicant's disclosure also does not remedy the aforementioned deficiencies.

As a result, *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Angwin* fails to teach or suggest at least "(a) broadcasting from a client computer a text message in a broadcast format using subject based addressing wherein the text message is a non-email formatted

message; text in a subject field of the text message; and a body of the text message contains a destination email address, email subject, and email body for the electronic email, wherein the client computer is part of a client-server architecture; (b) receiving the text message at a server computer of the client-server architecture after discerning from the text in the subject field that the text message is intended for the server computer; (c) reformatting the text message from the broadcast format to an email format having the destination email address, the email subject, and the email body from the text message; and (d) forwarding the reformatted text message to an email server that is compatible with the email format, wherein broadcasting includes transmitting a text message from a single component on a network," as recited in claim 29. Therefore, the rejection of claim 29 should be withdrawn. Since claim 32 depends from claim 29 and recites additional features, claim 32 is also allowable over the cited art.

F.   Claims 30-31 and 33

Assignee respectfully submits that *Lewis* does not make up for the deficiencies of *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Angwin* in disclosing all of the features of independent claim 29; *Ooe* does not make up for the deficiencies of *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Angwin* in disclosing all of the features of independent claim 29; and *Lewis* and *Bookspan* do not make up for the deficiencies of *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Angwin* in disclosing all of the features of independent claim 29.

Therefore, claims 30-31 and 33 are considered patentable over any combination of the cited art for at least the reason that claims 30-31 and 33 incorporate allowable features of claim 29 as set forth above.

      G.   <u>Claim 34</u>

Independent claim 34 recites:

> A system for sending an electronic mail from a client in a client-server architecture, the system comprising:
>
> **(a)   means for broadcasting from a client computer a text message in a broadcast format using subject based addressing wherein the text message is a non-email formatted message; text in a subject field of the text message; and a body of the text message contains a destination email address, email subject, and email body for the electronic email, wherein the client computer is part of a client-server architecture;**
>
> **(b)   means for receiving the text message at a server computer of the client-server architecture after discerning from the text in the subject field that the text message is intended for the server computer;**
>
> **(c)   means for reformatting the text message from the broadcast format to an email format having the destination email address, the email subject, and the email body from the text message; and**
>
> **(d)   means for forwarding the reformatted text message to an email server that is compatible with the email format;**
>
> **wherein broadcasting includes transmitting a text message from a single network component to all components on a network**.

(Emphasis added).

Independent claim 34 is allowable for at least the reason that the combination of *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Angwin* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "(a) means for broadcasting from a client computer a text message in a broadcast format using

subject based addressing wherein the text message is a non-email formatted message; text in a subject field of the text message; and a body of the text message contains a destination email address, email subject, and email body for the electronic email, wherein the client computer is part of a client-server architecture; (b) means for receiving the text message at a server computer of the client-server architecture after discerning from the text in the subject field that the text message is intended for the server computer; (c) means for reformatting the text message from the broadcast format to an email format having the destination email address, the email subject, and the email body from the text message; and (d) means for forwarding the reformatted text message to an email server that is compatible with the email format, wherein broadcasting includes transmitting a text message from a single network component to all components on a network," as emphasized above.

In an illustrative example, claim 34 provides for a messaging client, which does not have email software, to send an email message. This is done by the client broadcasting a text message containing email components (email body, subject, and address) intended for a messaging server. The server accepts the message and reformats the message as an email message. The email message is then forwarded to an email server from the messaging server. The email server can then send the email message.

In contrast, *O'Neal* discloses a message router which translates a message addressed to multiple recipients to multiple individual messages each addressed to an individual recipient. *See* abstract and summary. However, *O'Neal*

discloses: "A textual item is entered into a computer 204 at POINT A and transmitted to a computer at POINT B, thus achieving text-to-text messaging, principally in the email format." Paragraph 0049. Accordingly, in *O'Neal*, text messaging is synonymous with email messaging. For example, *O'Neal* describes a scenario where a broadcast text message 506 is to be transmitted across a data network as an email. *O'Neal* explains "because the broadcast message 506 is already compatible with julie's receiving device 532 and because julie's receiving device 532, a computer 532, is addressable over the data network. The message router 514 supplies julie's email address and provides the fourth message 540 to the data network server 512 for delivery to a local data network interface 530 in Sao Paolo." Paragraph 0074. Therefore, as explained above, the broadcast message 506 is not reformatted as an email message, since the broadcast message is already in an email format.

Accordingly, *O'Neal* fails to address a server receiving a text message, reformatting the text message into an email format, and forwarding the message onto an email server. Additionally, in *O'Neal*, a message is "broadcasted" only to addresses contained in the message and not to all components on a network. Further, in *O'Neal*, a recipient of a text message is not disclosed to receive the text message after discerning from a subject of the text message that the message is intended for the recipient. For at least these reasons, *O'Neal* fails to teach or suggest at least "(a) means for broadcasting from a client computer a text message in a broadcast format using subject based addressing wherein the text message is a non-email formatted message; text in a subject field of the text message; and a body of the text message contains a destination email address,

email subject, and email body for the electronic email, wherein the client computer is part of a client-server architecture; (b) means for receiving the text message at a server computer of the client-server architecture after discerning from the text in the subject field that the text message is intended for the server computer; (c) means for reformatting the text message from the broadcast format to an email format having the destination email address, the email subject, and the email body from the text message; and (d) means for forwarding the reformatted text message to an email server that is compatible with the email format, wherein broadcasting includes transmitting a text message from a single network component to all components on a network," as recited in claim 34.

Further, *Holmes* describes matching an address of a sender with an alias of the sender associated with a reply. Accordingly, *Holmes* fails to address a server receiving a text message, reformatting the text message into an email format, and forwarding the message onto an email server.

Also, *Spearman* describes a wireless provisioning device capable of routing TCP/IP traffic. *Spearman* further discloses a gateway converting messages "between services using different E-mail protocols." Col. 4, lines 18-20. Accordingly, *Spearman* fails to address a server receiving a text message, reformatting the text message into an email format, and forwarding the message onto an email server.

As such, *Holmes* and *Spearman* do not remedy the deficiencies of *O'Neal*. In addition, *Angwin* discloses a process for automated discovery of a service menu by broadcasting a message to a plurality of devices connected to a network

requesting the service menu. *See* abstract. Accordingly, *Angwin* fails to address a server receiving a text message, reformatting the text message into an email format, and forwarding the message onto an email server. As such, *Angwin* does not remedy the deficiencies of *O'Neal*, *Holmes*, and *Spearman*. For that matter, the background section of Applicant's disclosure also does not remedy the aforementioned deficiencies.

As a result, *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Angwin* fails to teach or suggest at least "(a) means for broadcasting from a client computer a text message in a broadcast format using subject based addressing wherein the text message is a non-email formatted message; text in a subject field of the text message; and a body of the text message contains a destination email address, email subject, and email body for the electronic email, wherein the client computer is part of a client-server architecture; (b) means for receiving the text message at a server computer of the client-server architecture after discerning from the text in the subject field that the text message is intended for the server computer; (c) means for reformatting the text message from the broadcast format to an email format having the destination email address, the email subject, and the email body from the text message; and (d) means for forwarding the reformatted text message to an email server that is compatible with the email format, wherein broadcasting includes transmitting a text message from a single network component to all components on a network," as recited in claim 34. Therefore, the rejection of claim 34 should be withdrawn.

H.   Claim 35

Assignee respectfully submits that *Lewis* and *Bookspan* do not make up for the deficiencies of *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Angwin* in disclosing all of the features of independent claim 34. Therefore, claim 35 is considered patentable over any combination of the cited art for at least the reason that claim 35 incorporates allowable features of claim 34 as set forth above.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth above, all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or addressed, and that the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested.

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and Official Notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well-known for the particular and specific reasons that the claimed combinations are too complex to support such conclusions and because the Office Action does not include specific findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

_/Charles W. Griggers/_____

Charles W. Griggers, Reg. No. 47,283

AT&T Legal Department – TKHR
Attn: Patent Docketing
One AT&T Way
Room 2A-207
Bedminster, NJ 07921
Customer No.: **38823**